prayed that the records may be ordered to be kept in the courts at least for one year after their disposal.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration. Measures to save delay in sending references will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 24.

Noting the date of disposal in the copy applications to be dispensed with.

Mr. Suryanarayana Rao, Tumkur taluk.

Summary of discussion.—When applications for copies are presented to civil courts, the applicants are required to note therein the date of disposal of cases. There appears to be no difficulty in having the records if the number and the year are quoted in such applications. It is requested that the noting of the date of disposal of cases may be dispensed with.

Reply of Government.—The rules do not insist on the date of disposal being given. Individual representations may be made in regard to cases where this is required to be done to the courts concerned.

SUBJECT No. 25.

Court sales.

Mr. K. Krishnamurti Rao, Magadi taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Revenue and civil court sales which are at present conducted by Nazirs and other low paid officials without proper advertisement may be caused to be conducted through recognized agents on payment of 5 per cent commission on the sale proceeds.

Mr. K. Krishnamurti Rao pointed out two or three cases where properties were said to have been knocked down for low bids.

Messrs. Venkatachar and *Narasimhachar* represented on the other hand that there were sufficient provisions for setting aside a sale if there was no publication of proclamation, that the existing rules caused enough of delay and worry to decree holders and that the measure proposed would introduce further difficulties.

Reply of Government.—Not feasible.

Mr. Channakesavaiya made a request incidentally that time to present applications under Order XXI, Rule 89, might be extended to two months.

Reply thereon.— Noted.

SUBJECT No. 26.

Issue of cheques to parties in civil cases without the signatures of the lawyers.

Mr. Hutchaveere Gowda, Gubbi taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The civil courts insist upon the necessity of obtaining the signatures of the lawyers to cheque and cash books before the issue of cheques to the parties. This was not in vogue four or five years ago. It is therefore prayed that this practice may be stopped as it causes much inconvenience to the parties.

Reply of Government.—It is insisted upon for purposes of identification whenever necessary. It is sufficient if reliable witnesses are produced for identifying the parties concerned.

SUBJECT No. 27.

Copying paper.

Messrs. Viswanatha Setti, Channapatna municipality, Venkata-

Summary of discussion.—The price of copying paper is heavy. It is not provided with as many cages as are enough to copy out the number of words which were be-